DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 539 FL 020 286

AUTHOR Walton, A. Ronald
TITLE Expanding the Vision of Foreign Language Education: Enter the Less Commonly Taught Languages. NFLC Occasional Papers.
INSTITUTION Johns Hopkins Univ., Washington, DC. National Foreign Language Center.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Rate; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; Language Enrollment; Language Teachers; Pragmatics; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; Student Motivation; *Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

The less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) have entered mainstream foreign language teaching only in the last decade. The LCTLs include all languages other than French, German, and Spanish and can be divided into several subgroups, including "truly foreign languages" (TFLs) that are not cognate to English. While TFLs have never been very visible in American foreign language education, they have quietly emerged with their own traditions and modes of organization but operating largely on the profession's fringes. Differences between TFLs and traditionally taught languages include differences in linguistic code and language role for communication purposes. In TFL teaching and learning, pragmatics or behavioral culture is key to mastery of the linguistic code. Negotiation of meaning, central to communicative competence, should be central to TFL instruction. Two modes of pedagogical practice dominate TFL instruction in the United States: that of Indo-European languages and that of English as a Second Language. Successful blending of TFLs into mainstream foreign language education will require broadening traditional perspectives. Related issues include enrollment rate, differences between native and nonnative teachers, cultural differences, and student motivation. Mutual cooperation between the fields of traditionally taught languages and TFLs will be essential, replacing the current coexistence model. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED345539

NFLC

occasional papers

# *Expanding the Vision of Foreign Language Education: Enter the Less Commonly Taught Languages*

A. RONALD WALTON
*National Foreign Language Center*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Lambert
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**The National Foreign Language Center**
**Washington, D.C. 20036**

FL 020 286



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**About the Author**

A. Ronald Walton is Associate Professor of Chinese Language and Linguistics and Acting Director of the Language Center at the University of Maryland, College Park, and Deputy Director of the National Foreign Language Center at the Johns Hopkins University. Previously, Professor Walton taught Chinese Language and Linguistics at Cornell University and the University of Pennsylvania. He served on the committees that developed the ACTFL/ILR revised Generic Proficiency Guidelines and the Chinese Proficiency Guidelines, has been active in working with language study programs in China, and is past-president of the National Association of Self-Instructional Programs. Professor Walton is co-director of the recently formed National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages, the co-principal investigator of a major Ford Foundation grant for the improvement of the teaching and learning of the less commonly taught languages, and co-director, with the College Board, of an NEH-sponsored project to develop curricular guidelines and a College Board achievement test for Japanese at the high school level.

**About the *Occasional Papers***

This is the tenth in a series of *Occasional Papers* published by the National Foreign Language Center. The NFLC prints and distributes articles on a wide variety of topics related to foreign language research, education, and policy. *The Occasional Papers* are intended to serve as a vehicle of communication and stimulant for discussion among groups concerned with these topic areas. The views expressed in these papers are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NFLC or of the Johns Hopkins University.

**About the National Foreign Language Center**

The National Foreign Language Center (NFLC), a non-profit organization established within the Johns Hopkins University in 1987 with support from major private foundations, is dedicated to improving the foreign language competency of Americans. The NFLC emphasizes the formulation of public policy to make our language teaching systems responsive to national needs. Its primary tools in carrying out this objective are:

• **Surveys** - The NFLC conducts surveys to collect previously unavailable information on issues concerning national strength and productivity in foreign language instruction, and our foreign language needs in the service of the economic, diplomatic, and security interests of the nation.

• **National Policy Planning Groups** - In order to address major foreign language policy issues, the NFLC convenes national planning groups that bring together users of foreign language services and representatives of the language instructional delivery systems in formal education, the government, and the for-profit sector.

• **Research** - The NFLC conducts research on innovative, primarily individual-oriented strategies of language learning to meet the nation's foreign language needs of the future.

In addition the NFLC maintains an Institute of Advanced Studies where individual scholars work on projects of their own choosing.

The results of these surveys, discussions, and research are made available through the NFLC's publications, such as these *Occasional Papers*, and they form the basis of fresh policy recommendations addressed to national leaders and decision makers.

We wish to thank Garland Publishing Inc. for granting permission to reprint this article which first appeared in *Critical Issues in Foreign Language Instruction*, edited by Ellen S. Silber (Garland Publishing Inc., New York, 1991).

Copyright 1992, The National Foreign Language Center
at the Johns Hopkins University

# *Expanding the Vision of Foreign Language Education: Enter the Less Commonly Taught Languages*

A. Ronald Walton
National Foreign Language Center

## Introduction

Among the many trends that have characterized foreign language instruction in the 1980s is the entry of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) into the educational mainstream. According to the Modern Language Association (MLA) statistics (Brod, 1988) the highest rates of enrollment growth in the U.S. at the college level are in Japanese (with a 45 percent enrollment growth between 1983 and 1986) and Chinese (with a 29 percent growth in the same time period).* Walker (1989) has discussed at some length the causes for this new national interest in some of the LCTLs and has presented a rationale for the likelihood of future growth.

To say that the LCTLs, or at least several of them, have entered the mainstream does not mean that their presence is overwhelming. Enrollments in the LCTLs comprise less than 1 percent of all foreign language enrollments at the K-12 level (Dandonoli, 1987) and approximately 5-8 percent of total foreign language enrollments in colleges and universities (Brod, 1988). Nevertheless, even this very slight presence on the national scene has created new-found interest in the LCTLs.[1]

The growing presence of three of the LCTLs, Chinese, Japanese and Russian, can be seen as a test-case of what happens and what will happen in the future, as the less commonly taught languages enter an educational domain that has been dominated by the teaching of French, German, and Spanish. It is to the interface of the world of the LCTLs with that of the traditionally taught languages that this paper is addressed. In particular, its purpose is to foster a deeper understanding of the differences between the teaching and learning of the more and less commonly taught languages. The hope is that such a discussion will promote a smoother entry of the LCTLs into the mainstream and will engender an atmosphere of mutual cooperation between the "old timers" and the "new kids on the block."

## Defining the LCTLs

From the perspective of foreign language education in the U.S., the LCTLs could be defined as all languages other than French, German, and Spanish. A crude division of the LCTLs recognizes three subgroups: (1) less commonly taught European languages such as Russian, Italian, Portuguese, and Swedish; (2) higher-enrollment non-Indo-European languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese; and (3) lower-enrollment non-Indo-European languages such as Burmese, Indonesian, and Swahili. Obviously, using a single term such as "LCTLs" to define a group of languages so diverse and large is fairly meaningless other than as a contrast to French, German, and Spanish. Equally evident is that no single person can characterize the teaching and learning of this enormous range of languages without the danger of overgeneralization.

Thus, this paper will focus mainly on the non-Indo-European languages as defined by subgroups (2) and (3) above. Languages falling within these two subgroups are sometimes termed "Truly Foreign Languages" (TFLs) to distinguish them from languages that are cognate to English, a distinction that is explained in detail below. While the discussion here applies in varying degrees to

---

** The MLA Fall 1990 Survey of Foreign Language Enrollments in U.S. Colleges and Universities reports a figure of 95 percent increase in Japanese enrollments and a 15 percent increase for Chinese for the period 1986-1990.*

all TFLs taught in the United States, Chinese and Japanese will be singled out for special attention for several reasons: these languages are currently of high interest nationally; they are among the most difficult LCTLs taught in this country; and the author is familiar with them. Chinese and Japanese will thus serve as interesting representatives of other TFLs taught in the United States.

**The Educational Tradition of the TFLs**

While the TFLs have never occupied a highly visible position in American foreign language education, they have quietly developed in educational settings since World War II. Over the years the TFLs have evolved their own educational traditions and modes of organization. For the most part, TFL programs have been housed in larger universities (though not exclusively), have been tied to area studies programs, and have focused on the training of area scholars at the graduate level. However, some undergraduate institutions have long traditions in teaching one or another of the major TFLs. In addition, government language training organizations such as the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and the Defense Language Institute (DLI) have an impressive history in providing instruction in a number of TFLs.

A crucial factor in the development and maintenance of the teaching of the TFLs in academe has been support under Title VI, originally of the National Defense Education Act, currently of the Higher Education Act. The latter presently supports the teaching of approximately one hundred and fifty TFLs at the graduate level in over ninety universities and colleges. These funds are primarily used for fellowships for budding area studies scholars, not for materials development, teacher training, curriculum design, or standardized test development. Other provisions within Title VI, however, do allow competition for modest grants to enhance some TFL development activities. Support from the U.S. Office of Education as well as from private foundations has played a critical role in developing and enhancing the infrastructure that supports ongoing language instruction in these languages, though such support is, of course, never seen as adequate by those teaching the TFLs.

For some TFLs there are practically no instructional materials, for some there are materials from the home country of the native-speaking teachers, and for some there are a handful of texts produced by native English-speaking language specialists. In many cases, there are few modern linguistic analyses of the languages available. For others there are only such analyses, often in the form of handbooks and reference grammars, but no instructional materials per se. For many of the low-enrollment TFLs dictionaries are either outdated or nonexistent, and for the higher enrollment TFLs there is a constant need for improved and updated dictionaries.

A number of the TFLs have teaching associations representing a single language, such as the Chinese Language Teachers Association. Others unite professionals who teach languages from a geographical area, for example, African languages and Southeast Asian languages. In the latter, a number of often quite different, linguistically unrelated languages are grouped together in a single organization. The National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP), headquartered at Temple University, has for nearly thirty years been instrumental in helping colleges and universities set up self-instructional programs in a wide range of LCTLs.[2]

For those TFLs that are frequently taught, pedagogical traditions have evolved and even become somewhat canonized. In the teaching of Chinese, for example, certain curricular structures, teaching methods, and testing and evaluation procedures are found in most programs, though there is considerable variability in how these are implemented. Likewise, experienced Chinese teachers have identified the pronunciation and grammatical features that present native English-speaking students with the most serious learning problems, and these are routinely discussed in the teaching literature on Chinese.

In sum, the LCTLs do have their own world within American foreign language education: their own history, infrastructure, pedagogical traditions, financial support structures (however weak), and, of course, their own problems. However, it is a rather small world compared to that of French, German, and Spanish language instruction and one that operates largely on the fringes of foreign language education as a national endeavor.

**Characteristics of the TFLs**

The Foreign Service Institute and the Defense Language Institute have both divided the various languages that they teach into four categories based on learning difficulty for native English speakers. Difficulty is measured by the number of instructional contact hours required to reach prescribed levels of proficiency as determined by standardized proficiency tests. Proficiency is rated on a scale of 0 (no functional proficiency) to 5

(the proficiency of an educated native speaker). Category 1 languages, the easiest, include French, German, and Spanish and also languages such as Afrikaans, Norwegian, and Swahili.[3] Category 2 languages include Bulgarian, Farsi, Greek, Hindi, and Indonesian; Category 3 includes such languages as Burmese, Hebrew, Russian, Turkish, and Finnish. Category 4 languages include only Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean.

For a student with average language learning aptitude the FSI experience indicates that to reach a proficiency level of 2 requires 480 contact hours for a Category 1 language such as French, German or Spanish, but 1,320 contact hours for a Category 4 language such as Chinese or Japanese. Assuming an academic Chinese program that allotted ten contact hours per week at the elementary level, five hours per week at the intermediate level (many programs do not provide nearly so many contact hours at these two levels), and three hours per week at all subsequent levels, 1,320 contact hours would roughly correspond to eight years of academic study in order to reach the 2 proficiency rating. Based on the same contact hour scheme it would require roughly one and a half years to reach this same level in French.[4]

Interestingly, the four languages most often targeted for mainstreaming these days include three Category 4 languages (Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese) and one Category 3 language, Russian (classified in this paper as an LCTL but not a TFL). What makes learning these languages so time-consuming for native English speakers? For the Category 4 languages there is no doubt that the non-alphabetic writing systems greatly slow the pace of learning, not just because of the complexity of their orthographies but because time spent on mastering the written medium cuts significantly into the time available to work on oral and aural skills.

However, there are learning problems for all the non-Indo-European languages that are rarely encountered in the teaching and learning of French, German, and Spanish. It was just because of the poor fit between the nature of the traditionally taught languages and the LCTLs that the original American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Generic Proficiency Testing Guidelines were of necessity revised.

The differences between the traditionally taught languages and the TFLs may be divided into at least two broad areas: (1) differences in the linguistic code (which includes the sound system, morphology, grammar, lexicon, discourse features, and orthographies of a given language), and (2) differences in the way that a language is used for interpersonal and interpretive intercultural communication.

Differences in the linguistic code are the most obvious, the most studied and the most often discussed. The sound systems of various non-Indo-European languages, including such exotica as tones and clicks, can be much more challenging to learners than those of the traditionally taught languages. Morphological systems can contain tortuous morphophonemics; even the definition of the notion "word" may be problematic. Grammar may present not just complex sentence constructions but conceptual schemes for classifying human and material existence which are entirely alien to English speakers. Thus the learner must not only come to see the world or "Reality" in ways quite different from those described by the traditionally taught Indo-European languages, but must also learn to encode this new perception into language use. The honorific system of Japanese and its grammatical encoding in the language code is a typical example. The ways in which discourse is structured in the TFLs are likely to vary significantly from the Indo-European languages as well. The general avoidance of direct orders in Japanese and the tendency in both Chinese and Japanese to avoid direct negatives in response to requests are common examples.[5]

Perhaps the least obvious, least studied, and least discussed differences between Indo- and non-Indo-European languages are those dealing with the way that language is used within social contexts, an area now commonly termed "pragmatics." Leech (1983) recognizes two subsystems within general pragmatics that seem particularly pertinent in characterizing language use in the TFLs: "sociopragmatics," how language is used within the social contexts of a given culture, and "pragmalinguistics," how communicative language use is encoded into the language of the given culture. For the remainder of this discussion the term "pragmatics" will be used to label both of Leech's subsystems. Thus, the term "linguistic code," as noted above, refers to the linguistic systems of a language, such as the sound system and grammar, and pragmatics refers to how this code is used in social contexts.

The gap between the pragmatic systems of the Indo- and non-Indo-European languages can be enormous, so much so that the greatest hurdles facing learners of non-Indo-European languages may be in this realm rather than in that of the linguistic code. The problem is aggra-

vated by the fact that our theoretical understanding of pragmatic systems is still quite rudimentary when compared to the rich and ever evolving theories and accumulated knowledge of the linguistic code. Yet, in teaching the non-Indo-European languages, every facet of instruction—dialogue study, drills, communicative use, the interpretation of texts, teaching style—is permeated with the reality of significant differences between the pragmatic systems of English and related languages and those of the various TFLs.

**The Role of Culture in Teaching the TFLs**

Hammerly (1982) divides the teaching of culture in the context of foreign language instruction into three categories: Achievement Culture, Informational Culture and Behavioral Culture. The first is associated with the features of "High Culture" (history, the arts, and literature, for example), and the second with facts about a given culture or country (geography, political system). Hammerly's third category, Behavioral Culture, would seem to include the conventions for interpersonal communication or pragmatics.[6] With regard to this last category, study of the TFLs involves much more than knowing, for example, that the Japanese bow upon introduction or that they exchange their shoes for slippers when entering the house. This third category fits somewhat with the notion of intercultural pragmatics discussed above and focuses on what should and should not be said in particular social interactions, which topics should and should not be discussed, and how topics and discourse should be tailored depending on the social status and the familiarity of the interlocutors, among other factors.

In the teaching and learning of the TFLs, it is quite clear that pragmatics ideally drives mastery of the linguistic code and that an enormous amount of attention must be devoted to the mastery of the particular TFL's pragmatic system from the first moment of instruction. In Japanese, for example, even to learn how to say "good morning," "thank you," and the usual classroom expressions (for example "please repeat") requires learners to understand that there are quite different grammatical forms for expressing these simple notions that depend on the social status of the speaker and the addressee and on their familiarity with one another: there is no single form for expressing such utterances, for there is no such thing as socially neutral speech in Japanese.

The pragmatic systems of various TFLs can be so different from that of English that it is even challenging to learn how to speak pragmatically appropriate English to members of these cultures who speak English as a second language. For example, a useful technique in preparing businesspeople who cannot devote the necessary time to study Chinese and Japanese would be to teach them how to speak English to a Chinese official or Japanese businessperson who speaks English. Well-trained and experienced teachers of Japanese understand that for an American high school student of Japanese, learning how to speak pragmatically appropriate English to an English-speaking Japanese will be a greater challenge than learning the Japanese sound system or the symbols of the Japanese syllabary.

Such a needed emphasis on pragmatics in the TFLs contrasts sharply with much of the literature on the teaching of culture in the European languages. For instance, the articles in the 1988 Northeast Conference volume, *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*, seem to place almost equal emphasis on the teaching of Achievement Culture, Informational Culture and Behavioral Culture. In teaching a Category 4 TFL such as Chinese or Japanese the complexity of the language itself—the linguistic code and the pragmatic system—is so great and the instructional time so valuable that there is simply no time to attempt a systematic introduction to thousands of years of Achievement and Informational Culture. A less systematic introduction to such elements of culture is likely to be a waste of time and may end up simply degenerating into the presentation of the very stereotypes regarding these cultures that one wishes to eradicate rather than reinforce.

Given the richness and complexity of these civilizations, in addition to the American student's total lack of familiarity with them, it becomes imperative that features of Chinese and Japanese civilization not directly related to Behavioral Culture be taught in separate courses—one obvious rationale for the traditional area studies model. Moreover, since mastery of the languages proceeds slowly, there is little likelihood that using the target language to teach about the civilization will be a viable process at the undergraduate level; certainly not nearly as effective as presenting such information in English.

The complexity and subtlety of the pragmatic systems of the TFLs likewise have serious implications for teaching methodologies and pedagogical practice generally. Many of the procedures common to instruction in the European languages are of questionable value in

teaching the TFLs and may even be pedagogically harmful. For example, it is fairly standard practice in the teaching of European languages for students to practice speaking the target language to one another. Since the goal of language instruction is to prepare students to undertake intercultural communication, such practice may well encourage learners to continue using the English pragmatic system, though using it with the target language linguistic code. In fact, it is exactly the unlearning of the English (and, broadly speaking, Indo-European language) pragmatic system that proves more challenging than mastering a new linguistic code. Since learners can assume that practically nothing in the English pragmatic system will transfer to communication with members of a TFL culture, and since the purpose of instruction is largely geared to acquiring this new pragmatic system, premature emphasis on students' speaking to one another in the target language must be seen for what it is, not intercultural communication but "same culture" communication with a different linguistic code.

The same might be said of native English-speaking instructors teaching such languages as Chinese and Japanese in the classroom. This again is "same culture" communication, and while native English speakers may be competent in the target language code, they will never be authentic bearers of the pragmatic system, for they simply are not native Chinese or Japanese. This is revealed clearly in the differences between the classroom teaching styles of native and nonnative teachers of Chinese and Japanese. Particularly noteworthy are the different reactions and attitudes of these two types of teachers regarding communication with English-speaking learners.

For the native-speaking teacher, classroom discussions of certain topics such as sex, death, and what might be seen as "negative features" of the culture (for example, the fact that Chinese rarely form lines but crash forward onto buses or toward service windows and counters) can be seen as inappropriate or even embarrassing. Such cultural phenomena are likely to be approached with a great degree of indirectness, even avoidance. Quite often, native speakers of Chinese and Japanese are not even aware of the very cultural and communicative features that foreigners regard as the most challenging and problematic.

However, a native English-speaking teacher of Japanese is quite unlikely to "feel" such embarrassment instinctively when communicating with American learners and may approach the discussion of such topics with the candor characteristic of an American mind-set: that is, there will not be the emotional, even chemical response of the genuine native speaker to such common teacher reactions as disappointment, disapproval, evasiveness, anger, frustration, approval, encouragement, surprise, patience, and urgency. Thus, since nonnative teachers will not intuitively provide authentic pragmatic responses, the student will not be properly prepared for authentic intercultural communication with native speakers. The instructional process simply loses validity if it is not geared to genuine intercultural communication. A great fear in the teaching of the TFLs is that a learner will excel in the linguistic code, thus increasing native speaker expectations about the foreigner's control of the pragmatic system, but will fail in the pragmatic domain, thus creating more damage in intercultural situations than if the student were poor in both domains.

Issues related to authentic intercultural communication in the classroom also arise in oral proficiency testing. It is common practice in the traditional languages for both tester and student to be American. If the purpose of the test is to gauge the learner's ability to conduct intercultural communication, can there be any test validity when a member of one culture judges another member of the same culture? This is not a test of intercultural communicative ability but rather of "same culture" communicative ability. Surely a genuine test of intercultural communication must require the judgments of one who represents the target culture. Oral testing by native speakers of the target language is standard procedure in the long history of government-program language testing (as in the FSI and DLI).

The present emphasis in foreign language teaching on communicative competence is often described as a process of teaching students to negotiate meaning. What remains in the shadows is just what the negotiation process really represents when native English speaking students are negotiating meaning with one another or with a native English-speaking teacher. They are indeed negotiating "meaning" if this refers to the process of using the linguistic code of the target foreign language, but it is difficult to understand how they are negotiating meaning across different cultures if they are members of the same culture. For the TFLs it is the negotiation of meaning across different cultures that should form the heart of the instructional process, for we are supposedly educating our students to interact successfully with members of another culture, not our own.

In sum, if in the traditional languages there is a constant attempt to try to figure out how to merge knowledge of culture with the teaching of the linguistic code, in the TFLs there is an equal amount of effort directed at how to constrain the teaching of culture, to off-load the teaching of Achievement and Informational Culture, and at the same time to ensure that the teaching of Behavioral Culture will dominate the instructional process.

**Pedagogical Practice in the TFLs**

Two models of pedagogical practice seem to dominate foreign language instruction in the United States, that of the Indo-European languages and that of English as a Second Language (ESL). Some hints have already been presented that the former model may in many respects be inappropriate for the TFLs. ESL pedagogical practice, as developed and valuable as it is in the sphere of research and innovation, also meshes poorly with many facets of teaching and learning the TFLs. For example, ESL textbooks are invariably written in English, the target language of the learner. A student of Chinese or Japanese who could read textbook instructions and grammatical explanations in these languages would have to be, at a minimum, at the level 2 proficiency in reading, a goal that may well require the estimated 1,320 hours of instruction discussed earlier. English is alphabetic. ESL students have often been studying English since the seventh grade (or earlier) in their home countries. ESL students live in the target culture and can use the language daily for real communication. Many ESL students may wish to integrate into American culture (a real possibility in a pluralistic society), and quite a few ESL students are mastering academic English for study at an American university.

In contrast, Chinese and Japanese are not alphabetic languages and from the foreign learner's viewpoint the spoken and written media are like two unrelated languages. Unlike the case so often found in ESL/EFL (English as a Foreign Language) where students can read English with some facility but arrive in the U.S. unable to speak it well, reading in Chinese and Japanese by foreigners is likely to come well after spoken ability and with great difficulty at that. Lengthy exposure to the nonphonetic or quasi-phonetic writing systems of Chinese and Japanese is less likely to contribute to development of oral and aural skills as is the case in studying languages with alphabetic writing systems. American students, unlike their ESL counterparts, are unlikely to have had any exposure to a TFL prior to college. Moreover, American students rarely study in Chinese and Japanese universities and thus do not seek such specialized and focused training, nor are they likely to desire to integrate into these cultures as their ESL colleagues might desire to fit into American society. In any case, such integration is highly unlikely in cultures where foreigners are forever seen as foreigners regardless of linguistic or pragmatic skills.

In addition, the ESL model generally does not follow the practice of systematically contrasting the learner's language and culture with the English language and with American culture. Indeed, ESL classes may well have members of a number of different cultures, so such a procedure would place impossible burdens on ESL teachers. However, in teaching the TFLs, where the learners are essentially a homogeneous cultural and linguistic group, contrast is inevitable and moreover highly efficient. This is particularly true of what Ellis (1985) terms "contrastive pragmatics." Assuming that one learns the new in terms of the known, the teaching of intercultural pragmatics requires that learners be made aware of their native pragmatic system as a way of modifying this system to fit in the new and quite different pragmatic system of a TFL.

The reason for mentioning the traditional-language and ESL models is that many foreign language educators seem to believe that teaching the TFLs is somehow still dominated by audio-lingualism. For example, it is standard practice in much of the teaching of TFLs to have students work with dialogues for mastery and to devote considerable time to mechanical drills prior to communicative activities. The stress on dialogue mastery, where the dialogues have been properly designed (unfortunately not always the case), comes from the fact that they are ideal for presenting the highly contrastive pragmatic system of the TFL. Situated speech is everything. Moreover, the complexities of the sound, grammatical, and morphological systems are such that a great deal of work on basic mechanics is a prerequisite for communicative practice.

The emphasis on inductive learning, often discussed in the teaching of the European languages, can prove problematic in learning the TFLs. Perhaps what makes successful induction possible in the learning of Indo-European languages is that most American learners already speak an Indo-European language and are already members of an Indo-European culture. The practice of

guessing from context (either interpersonal or textual), for instance, presumes that the learner is able to "read" the foreign context. This is quite unlikely in teaching Chinese and Japanese to the beginner, for there is little in the learner's experience that would prepare him or her to understand the context at all. It is more probable that guessing would lead to the wrong conclusion, particularly as regards pragmatics.

Examples such as these can be multiplied by the hundreds, because the teaching of each TFL has its own unique pedagogical practices that have evolved with time and experience. Yet many of these procedures would not be characteristic of pedagogical practice in either the traditional languages or ESL. Of course, to the degree that second language acquisition is based on universal psycholinguistic principles, the TFLs are subject to the same general canons of language mastery as are the European languages and ESL. Second language acquisition is not the same as second language teaching, however, and to the degree that TFLs have unique linguistic and pragmatic features it is only natural to expect different teaching practices.

**Perceptions: The Cognate Languages and the TFLs**

The picture of the TFLs presented so far suggests that their successful blending into a national system of language instruction based on French, German, and Spanish will require that those within this long-standing and quite elaborated tradition see their world from a much broader perspective than is usually the case. Ruhlen (1987) divides the world's languages into seventeen phyla (plus four additional categories) including Khosian, Nilo-Saharan, Afro-Asiatic, Altaic, Sino-Tibetan, Austric, and Indo-Pacific as examples. Within any given phylum there may be hundreds of languages used by many millions of speakers. By our tradition and national history it turns out that what we mean by "foreign language teaching" in American culture is really the teaching of three Category 1 Indo-European languages to the speakers of another Indo-European language, English. A rough estimate based on figures cited above by Dandonoli (1987) and Brod (1989) is that at least 95 percent of all foreign language enrollments in the U.S. from kindergarten through college are in French, German, and Spanish. Walker (1989) estimates that over 90 percent of the enrollments in foreign language study in the U.S. are in languages that represent only 14 percent of the world's population.

In broadening one's perspective about foreign language education in the United States, it would seem more sensible to classify French, German, and Spanish (among others) as "cognate" languages and cultures, and reserve the term "foreign language" for non-cognate language and cultures.[7] Jorden and Walton (1987) term the latter group "Truly Foreign Languages," the term that has been adopted for the present discussion. The reason that this distinction is so crucial in approaching the gradual inclusion of the TFLs into the mainstream is that much of what is claimed or believed to be true about the teaching and learning of "foreign languages" may often be relevant to the teaching and learning of cognate languages only, as was discussed in the two sections above. Given Ruhlen's classification of the world's languages, it is fairly simple to make the case that cognate languages, when contrasted with languages from different phyla, are a very limited, special, even idiosyncratic subclass of languages; and cognate or related cultures are a very special subclass within the classification of the world's cultures.

In this light, then, our national system of language teaching with its emphasis on French, German, and Spanish can be viewed as a very atypical system from a global linguistic and cultural viewpoint, atypical in that what is termed "foreign" is actually not really very foreign. The use of terms such as "cognate" and "truly foreign" is thus not at all trivial. Indeed, much more than a mere academic tradition, the association of the notion "foreign language" with French, German, and Spanish is a part of our national mind-set.

In order to reveal clearly the quite narrow and unique character of the cognate language tradition in foreign language education in the United States, it is useful to view this tradition as it is seen by those who teach in the world of the TFLs. All three of the major cognate languages are classified in Category 1 with the implication that they are, relatively speaking, the easiest for native English speakers to master. The American university is based on the Western European model and the cognate languages come with this model. As a consequence, one finds that the study of cognate languages is tied in intricate ways to the importance of a college education quite naturally steeped in the cultural values of European history and civilization. Since these cultural values are particularly pervasive in the definition of a liberal arts education, foreign language study within this model is closely linked to the humanities where it is often the "study" of a foreign language that has value rather than the ability

to use the language for practical, functional communication (see Redfield, 1989, for a discussion of this latter point).

In making the case for the reinstatement of language requirements, one argument is that the "study" of foreign (read cognate) languages teaches the appreciation of another language and culture, as well as one's own, and also enhances analytic and higher-order skill development. The latter rationale is often given for language study in grades K-12. Most noticeable about the cognate language tradition, however, is its close association with the study of literature, so that almost all cognate languages are taught at the tertiary level in literature departments (regardless of the department's name: "Department of Modern Foreign Languages," for example).

If it is acceptable to entertain the notion that foreign language education in the U.S. is most often cognate language education, then it must also be noted that this system is a consequence of American educational history. Our tradition has always placed foreign language study in the context of a liberal arts education, stressing literature and the other humanities disciplines. The picture would be radically changed if our foreign language requirement called for the study of at least two years of a truly foreign language and if the three major languages offered at post-secondary institutions were Shona, Japanese, and Tagalog. These languages would not fit with the European university model with its emphasis on the arts, history, philosophy and literature of the Western tradition. Given the difficulty of learning such languages one might expect to find linguists rather than literature specialists in charge of language programs. It is probable that the thousands of articles on foreign language teaching and learning that abound in journals on language pedagogy would be of a radically different nature than is now the case. In short, there might be a significantly different national and educational mind-set about what a foreign language is and how foreign languages are taught and learned.

This expanded perspective paves the way for a better understanding of the world of the TFLs. Instruction in these languages has usually developed within an area studies framework in contrast with the liberal arts model within which cognate language instruction evolved. Instruction in the TFLs has no necessary connection with the European educational system which teaches French, German, and Spanish, as well as Latin and Greek, in a context of the history and values of Western civilization. We have noted that Chinese and Japanese are Category 4 languages. Two years of college study, a typical requirement for Category 1 cognate languages, is merely an introduction to a language in Category 4. Better understanding of one's own language and culture or the development of analytic or critical skills is rarely, if ever, given by either students or teachers of the TFLs as a rationale for language study. There is no particular reason to associate the study of a foreign language with the value of a liberal arts education nor with literature, though one would hope that the study of any second language would encourage such goals. Nor is there likely to be a constant concern with how to include culture in language courses, for culture properly subsumes study of the linguistic code from the outset in TFL teaching and learning because of the role that it plays in intercultural communication and pragmatics.

The teaching of Achievement and Informational Culture in Chinese, for example, is typically the responsibility of area studies experts who offer highly specialized courses in Chinese History, Chinese Political Science, Chinese Anthropology, Chinese Economics, and Chinese Philosophy. On the other hand, one often finds the notion in the teaching of the cognate languages that students should learn about the "civilization" of a given European culture, the features of Achievement and Informational Culture, in the language classroom; one is less likely to find individual specialists in French History, French Political Science, French Economics, French Anthropology, and French Philosophy. Most accessible to students of French will be specialists in French literature.

Finally, the linguistic nature of the TFLs and the unique pedagogical approaches necessary to teach and learn them would seem to require of the cognate language teaching community, not merely a wider perspective of foreign language education, but one that is radically different. It is clear that TFL language study should have its own model, distinct from that of the cognate languages and ESL. There will, of course, be similarities among all three models. This does not, however, logically lead to the conclusion that the TFLs should adopt either of the other two models. In fact, logic suggests that the teaching and learning of cognate languages be a special subset of the teaching of TFLs and not the other way around. The same logic would suggest that the teaching and learning of Category 4 languages, and related research, be the highest order models for the teaching and pedagogical research agendas of Category 1, 2, and 3

languages, since all pedagogical issues in these three categories are presumably subsumed under those facing Category 4 languages.

At present, this is not the case. Truly foreign languages and Category 4 languages do not lead the way in foreign language education, though the potential for such leadership surely exists. TFL teaching, learning, and second language acquisition research has suffered from national neglect and an appalling lack of resources. Thus, we should not be surprised at the low quality of text materials in many (though not all) of the LCTLs, the lack of teacher training, and the lack of more sophisticated curricular designs. What is needed by the TFLs is not pedagogical guidance from the cognate languages and ESL, for this may prove inapplicable, but rather assistance informed by the knowledge of the special features of the TFLs. Above all, what is needed is the allocation of sufficient resources for those in the LCTLs themselves to improve their pedagogical practice and implement their own agenda of second language acquisition research.

**Administrative and Program Features of the TFLs**

The mainstreaming of the TFLs seems nowadays focused on the creation of new programs in colleges which have historically taught only the cognate languages and in the high schools that likewise have a strictly cognate language tradition. In college settings it is likely that TFLs such as Japanese and Chinese will be added to cognate language departments or will be administered in special programs. A typical scenario is to try out one or two TFLs in an experimental mode and move to a more permanent structure only if there is enough enrollment growth to support a full-time and/or tenure-track appointment. When such language programs are successful there is likely to be some thought given to introducing several area studies courses as well.

Those who teach in cognate language departments are familiar with the fact that there are differences between native and nonnative teachers. They are also aware that the educational systems and intellectual traditions of French, German, and Spanish differ not only among themselves but also contrast with educational practice and intellectual values of the American tradition (see Kramsch [1989] for an interesting discussion of this point). However, all four traditions share common roots and an enormous similarity when compared with the educational and intellectual traditions of truly foreign languages and cultures.

When a TFL is added to a cognate language department, administrators should not expect that just another language is entering the curriculum. Both the languages and the teachers will be distinctly different. Native speaking teachers of Chinese and Japanese, for instance, bring with them educational backgrounds and styles of interaction, both professional and personal, that may contrast sharply with administrative and educational practices heavily steeped in the European tradition.

For example, it is not uncommon for native speaking Japanese teachers to feel uncomfortable in giving D's and F's. Moreover, the concept of a Japanese "sensei" or a Chinese "laoshi" is really not the same as that of an American "teacher." The educational tradition in these cultures places the "teacher" on a higher plane than his or her American counterpart. It has traditionally been the practice in Chinese classrooms in China for students to refrain from asking questions in case the teacher might lose face by not knowing the answer. There is little student-teacher interaction in such classrooms. Thus, the notion that language teachers should be "facilitators" or "managers" or that classrooms should be "student centered" are quite alien to many native Chinese and Japanese teachers. They are much more comfortable as the presenters of information in a lecture format, the mode in which they themselves were educated. An even more alien and threatening idea is that students might actually evaluate teachers.[8]

When dealing with administrative matters, a chairperson may misjudge the Japanese tendency to refrain from frankness on sensitive issues or the tendency to avoid saying "no" as a signal of agreement. In fact, the teacher may disagree quite strongly but would rather that his or her views be leaked to the Chairperson through a third party.

Another common problem for those not familiar with Asian cultures is to assume that Chinese, Japanese, and Korean languages and cultures are similar and thus to assume that one mode of administrative conduct will work for teachers of all three languages. A visit to an established East Asian language and area studies program will quickly reveal that differences among these cultures are in all likelihood much greater than those between French, German, and Spanish. This is to be expected, for though these Asian languages and cultures are geographically proximate, the cultures do not share the degree of similarity among each other that is so often assumed. Even with respect to the languages themselves

one must remember that Chinese and Japanese, for example, are genetically unrelated and are at almost opposite ends of the language-typology spectrum: Chinese is a Sino-Tibetan morphosyllabic tone language with essentially no inflectional system, whereas Japanese is an Altaic polysyllabic pitch-accent language with an extremely rich and complex inflectional system.

There are native English-speaking teachers of such TFLs as Chinese and Japanese, but they often work in coordination with native teachers. The tradition of native target-language teachers runs deep in the TFLs. This is partly because the cultures are so different from that of the American learner that native English-speaking teachers are sometimes seen as weak substitutes. In addition, among the small number of Americans who reach higher levels of competence in a Category 4 language, few elect to become language teachers. The cultural gap and the linguistic complexity of the languages are not, however, features that necessarily argue for the exclusive presence of native Chinese and Japanese teachers in a language program for foreign learners. The view that these native teachers have of their languages, their own experience in learning them and their educational traditions may sometimes interfere with presenting the language for acquisition by foreign learners.

Jorden and Walton (1987) have suggested that native-speaking teachers of the TFLs do not know what it is like to learn their language as a second language, nor what it is like to function as a foreigner in their home cultures. They also may lack the experience of having participated themselves as students within the American educational system. They are thus limited in what they can offer the foreign learner in formal educational settings in America. On the other hand, the native English-speaking teacher who has studied either Chinese or Japanese, has functioned as a foreigner in these cultures, is a product of the American educational system and has had pedagogical training may be better positioned to assist fellow Americans in the language learning process. Yet such native English-speaking teachers are neither native speakers of the target language nor authentic cultural models for students, whose primary challenge is to become effective intercultural communicators. Jorden and Walton thus propose a team teaching model—a teacher from the learner's own culture working hand-in-hand with a teacher from the target culture—as an approach that ensures the best possible education in both language and culture for the American student.

The team-teaching approach may strike many teachers of French, German, and Spanish and educational administrators who make budgetary and staffing decisions for language programs as an extravagant use of precious resources. We can probably ascribe this to the mind-set of Category 1 cognate language teaching and the concomitant lack of experience in dealing with Category 4 TFLs.

At the same time, those who work in the cognate language tradition will need to be aware that American students who take the TFLs may differ significantly in motivation and purpose from the typical cognate language student. It is unlikely that a student will take a Category 4 language just to satisfy a language requirement. Rather, the typical TFL student comes with curiosity and a plan, however vague, to use the language in some way as part of his or her post-graduate career. Thus, there is less concern with creating motivation than in maintaining and strengthening the learner's initial motivation as the complexity of the TFL becomes apparent.

Ethnic students can present certain problems in program administration. For example, many Chinese-Americans enroll in Chinese, often as a way of strengthening their cultural heritage and frequently under pressure from their parents. This can create the problem of how to place and evaluate "semi-native" speakers, and would seem to resemble the same sort of problem so often encountered in Spanish language programs in the United States. However, the Chinese case is much more complex since some students may speak Mandarin at home (with familiar register) but may be unable to read and write Chinese characters, a learning process that is certainly worthy of academic credit. Many Chinese Americans speak Cantonese, another Chinese language thought to differ from Mandarin about as much as French differs from Spanish, or even German. Thus learning Mandarin is obviously worthy of credit. It may be that a Cantonese American can read and write Chinese characters so that learning them in a Mandarin class is less difficult and worthy of credit, since the Cantonese character set, with some exceptions, is identical to the Mandarin character set, though the characters are pronounced quite differently. In short, questions of placement and credit can become fairly complicated when TFLs are part of a language program.

Those who have functioned only in the academic world of the cognate languages should be aware that this tradition harbors a number of expectations that may well

not apply to the TFLs. For example, the emphasis on literature by the second or third year of cognate language instruction differs significantly from a Category 4 language where literature, generally not the primary interest of undergraduate TFL students, is more appropriately treated as "language for special purposes" and is probably best reserved for the graduate level in all but very strong undergraduate programs.

Likewise, the difficulty of Category 4 languages argues against the probability of high enrollments that many administrators look for during the trial period when they decide whether or not to make a TFL a permanent feature of the curriculum. The failure to allot sufficient and appropriate resources, for example, by hesitating to utilize a native/nonnative teaching team for a Category 4 TFL, can place a fledgling TFL program in an unfair position when comparisons are made with enrollments and attrition rates in a cognate language. Expectations of collegiate behavior when it comes to working with TFL native speakers, especially those with little familiarity with American academic culture, will require a meaning of "collegiate" that goes beyond the European and American definition. In brief, teachers and administrators will need to be aware that the entry of a TFL into a school may well bring with it new and unfamiliar exercises in intercultural communication. Expectations about business as usual may require a fundamental reassessment in all matters, pedagogical and administrative.

**Mainstreaming the TFLs: The Future**

The mainstreaming of the TFLs is not for the most part a movement that began with mutual cooperation and building within the language teaching community, for this might have occurred many decades ago. It is rather a movement that has been recently imposed on this community by outside forces. It has in fact been generated by national concerns, especially that of economic competitiveness. These have trickled down from policy makers at the state and federal levels, the military and intelligence communities, business, parents, and students, to state foreign language administrators, college presidents and deans, school districts, language departments, and finally to the classroom. Just how the more and less commonly taught language traditions react to this new state of affairs will have much to do with the future of the TFLs in educational institutions.

While this paper has emphasized the desirability of cognate language teachers and administrators coming to appreciate the distinctive features of TFL language education, clearly understanding is a two-way street and it will behoove the TFL teaching community to become more familiar with the educational and pedagogical work of their colleagues in the cognate languages.

Mutual cooperation and understanding between these two worlds is necessarily predicated on a desire to work together. Some in the cognate language teaching community apparently see the entry of the TFLs as an unwelcome intrusion. This is understandable, for some administrators insist that the inclusion of a TFL portends the exclusion of a currently-taught cognate language. The reduction or elimination of German and Latin programs, in particular, is seen by some high school administrators as a price that must be paid for bringing aboard a TFL, or even a cognate LCTL such as Russian.

At the same time TFL teachers, few in number, often lacking in formal training and besieged with serious problems in the realm of text materials, curriculum design, professional standards, and especially a long-standing lack of adequate resources, have not been clamoring for expansion into additional instructional settings and instead are often more concerned with maintaining and strengthening enrollments in existing programs.

In this somewhat charged atmosphere one can imagine at least two different scenarios for the future mainstreaming of the TFLs: the coexistence model and the integration model. In the coexistence model, cognate language teachers may accept the fact that national demands and student interest argue for making a place for the TFLs, but may well be unenthusiastic about such a troublesome addition, sensing increased competition for students and the possible shrinkage of cognate language enrollments and programs. At the same time, practitioners within the TFL teaching community who have long since learned to survive outside the language education mainstream may prefer to be left alone to pursue their own agendas.

The coexistence model will work and in fact may already be the dominant model that has arisen in the 1980s. It is, however, a model that diminishes the potential of foreign language education (and education more generally) in a nation whose global role in the twenty-first century will certainly depend on a citizenry capable of functioning in a great variety of international and intercultural contexts. For those TFL teachers who do wish to see the national expansion of their languages, the coexistence model, while perhaps preferable and comfort-

able in the short term, is no doubt the more precarious route in the long run. As long as the TFL paradigm remains on the margin of the national educational infrastructure, however well it evolves internally it will be in constant jeopardy of retrenchment and reduction: last added, first eliminated.

The integration model, by contrast, does more than just allow for coexistence. Rather than competing for space in a room of fixed dimensions, the integration agenda looks deeply into the nation's educational goals and long-range needs and creates a larger and more richly furnished room. This room is, of course, simply a metaphor for an enriched vision of foreign language education. What makes such enrichment appealing is that both the cognate language and TFL traditions have much to offer one another.

The cognate language tradition has accumulated decades of experience in the broader contexts of foreign language education in the United States, from K-12 to the graduate level, whereas the TFLs have limited experience in much more restricted contexts. High school language teaching, in particular, is a world largely unknown to TFL teachers. The cognate languages, dealing as they must with larger and more complex programs, have evolved administrative and organizational skills and procedures that may be of considerable value to TFL programs as they move into the mainstream.

The cognate language tradition has a more extensive, more varied exposure to the American language learner's mind-set, knowledge of considerable value to the TFL teaching community which historically has often had the luxury of working with small numbers of highly motivated and perhaps even linguistically gifted students, although this luxury has been gradually vanishing in the teaching of some of the higher-enrollment TFLs. Even experience in how to popularize foreign language study is untraveled territory for many TFL teachers. Whereas language study in the TFLs has been predicated largely on the notion that the only legitimate goal is the development of functional skills for career and professional purposes, expansion into more varied educational contexts may argue for the value of the study experience itself, again an area of accumulated experience and thinking in the cognate language domain.

Issues of professionalization and standards, as well as the significant role that can be played by carefully structured, multiple-agenda national membership organizations, are commonplace for the cognate language community and no doubt deserve serious study by the TFL community as it emerges from its historical confines.

For the teachers of cognate languages, the contribution of the TFLs centers on years of accumulated experience in grappling with linguistic, pragmatic, and pedagogical issues that may well provide fresh and intriguing insights into the teaching of European languages. Some of the issues involving the teaching of culture in the TFLs have already been mentioned earlier, but there are many others. It has been suggested (Walton, 1987), for example, that in dealing with members of non-cognate cultures where foreigners are forever marked as obvious foreigners, and where there exists a code of interpersonal behavior expected of foreigners as contrasted to natives, the proficiency scale might better have as its ultimate target the "ideal foreigner" rather than the educated native speaker. Would this make sense for cognate languages as well? Is there a definition of intercultural communication as it is viewed in teaching the TFLs that contrasts with the definition in teaching the cognate languages? If so, how would these differences carry over into pedagogical practice in the two traditions and what can both learn from this comparison?

Because the TFLs obviously take longer to master, hour-by-contact-hour, there has evolved, in some languages at least, the practice of requiring considerable self-management of learning by the student. Would knowledge of the design of self-managed language learning environments acquired through this experience in the TFLs be of value to teachers of cognate languages? Research and pedagogical practices in teaching the reading of non-alphabetic writing systems result in a view of the reading process that differs rather dramatically from the view of this process in the cognate languages. Moreover, the relationship between oral/aural skill acquisition and development of the reading and writing skills has been and continues to be an area of concern and research in the TFLs. Cognate language teachers may discover in this research and instructional practice a fresh way of thinking about the skill of reading as well as its relationship to the acquisition of conversational skills. Likewise, years of experience in using the team teaching model followed in some TFL language programs has revealed the complementary strengths and weaknesses of native and nonnative teachers. Perhaps the insights garnered from this experience would be revealing for teachers of the cognate languages.

Chinese was the first language to develop a nation-

wide standardized proficiency test for listening and reading and the first to devise a national standardized indirect oral proficiency exam (using audiotape). Teachers of the LCTLs played a central role in developing the new revised ACTFL generic proficiency guidelines. Again, teachers of the cognate languages may wish to tap into the experience that TFL educators have accumulated in these efforts.

The coexistence model is unlikely to result in a fruitful exchange of teaching experience, curriculum design, pedagogical practice, and research on cognitive and second language acquisition factors that differ between the cognate and truly foreign languages. The integration model, in contrast, is predicated on precisely such exchanges. Beyond searching for commonalities and sharing differences in the pedagogical realm, however, true integration can be achieved only when the administrative infrastructure includes the teaching and teachers of the TFLs on an equal basis with cognate language teaching and teachers. Thus the role of administrators and decision makers both within foreign language education and the larger educational environment will be crucial in the movement to mainstream the TFLs.

From the administrator's point of view the coexistence model is a necessary, expedient, experimental first step. At the same time, this model brings with it all the ingredients for potential failure. The TFLs must demonstrate that they are viable. This requires resources and effective inclusion in the language teaching infrastructure. Yet they are often excluded from such resources and the infrastructure until they can demonstrate their viability.

Administrators, working to get things going, may not require that standards for accountability and teaching credentials for TFL teachers be identical to those of cognate language teachers. Some college, community college and high school programs are so desperate for teachers of Chinese and Japanese that normally required teaching standards are being by-passed through special certification procedures. As a result, one finds the incredible situation that strict certification procedures are required for a Category 1 cognate language, but are slighted for teachers of a Category 4 TFL. Thus, complex languages that require a high degree of pedagogical sophistication and teacher training have less stringent certification procedures than the instructionally less demanding Category 1 cognate languages. While some states might require that a native-speaking Chinese or Japanese teacher have an academic degree in some subject from the home country and thus be an "educated native speaker," there seems little awareness that what might count most for members of other cultures teaching American high school students is familiarity with the American high school environment, or at least preparation to teach in this environment through study in an American school of education, complete with supervised practice teaching.

The same syndrome may surface at the college level. Here programs and administrative decision makers are placing emphasis on finding "experienced" teachers rather than pedagogically trained teachers. There is a difference, since experience alone is no guarantee of quality or pedagogical sophistication. As a result of such administrative decisions, cognate language faculty may drift toward lowered rather than revised expectations for the TFLs. Just because these languages are difficult does not mean that they are somehow immune to the usual canons of quality in teacher certification and curricular design and especially in objective accountability to the learner.

One would hope that foreign language education policy and decision makers would thus adopt a dual track agenda in their efforts to mainstream the TFLs. One track would place emphasis on short-term, clearly transitional strategies to set up and staff TFL programs. The other would place equal emphasis on formulating longer-term plans to create an educational and administrative infrastructure that actually integrates the TFLs into the mainstream.

What one finds nowadays is much more emphasis on short-term planning than on a long-range vision. For instance, relaxing certification standards and relying on untrained TFL teachers (untrained in language teaching and/or education generally) to teach in the high schools is an emergency response to instructional demands. What seems to be missing are the much-needed discussions for building the long-term infrastructure to train and supply well-qualified teachers: are schools of education currently studying ways to include teacher training in the TFLs? Are efforts being made to identify the qualifications of those who will train future TFL teachers? Are schools of education going to transfer the cognate language and ESL teacher training models over to the TFLs, or are they approaching teacher training in these languages by first attempting to ascertain whether these two models are appropriate for TFL language education?

The TFLs are in desperate need of massive resources if they are to move from the fringes of language instruc-

tion into the mainstream. Where is the planning and strategy formulation that will make these resources available? Efforts to integrate the TFLs into the mainstream, rather than just allowing them to coexist with the cognate languages, must surely begin to address such issues.

In summary, the future of a new and expanded role for the TFLs within the context of American education rests on whether compelling arguments can be made to language teachers, both cognate and TFL, and to educational administrators and policymakers that the coexistence model should evolve into the integration model through conscious effort and thoughtful planning. For such a transition to succeed, educators and decision makers are much in need of data and analysis of current TFL resources, of the successes and failures of the various components of the initial coexistence model, and of attempts to move toward the integration model. Such data are now being collected in national surveys of the teaching of Chinese, Japanese and Russian conducted by the National Foreign Language Center.

## Conclusion

The LCTLs and the TFL subgroup have long since established a presence, however limited, in American foreign language education and will continue to hold a place regardless of whether or not they enter the national mainstream. Thus, it is not so much the fate of the LCTLs that is at stake but rather that of foreign language education for future generations of American citizens. Language educators must face not only what to do about current demands for the teaching of Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian but, more importantly, the issue of the integration of the LCTLs into the definition of foreign language education on a national scale. The LCTLs of concern today may not be the same ones of importance in a decade. What we have before us now is simply a test-case. The coexistence model of LCTL/TFL language instruction prevalent today is clearly a reactive model, a first response to unanticipated demand. Those outside foreign language education, from policymakers to parents, may come to judge the field of foreign language education, and perhaps in indirect ways the allocation of resources to it, according to how well it satisfies the educational needs of the American populace. This would not seem to be an unreasonable demand on the field of foreign language education, since it is one constantly applied to education in the humanities, in literacy, in science, in math, in medicine, and in technology, to name just a few current foci of the public's interest in national needs.

Foreign language educators have long advocated the importance of their subject matter, have presented their case to the public with vigor and have created an impressive rationale for the centrality of foreign language study in the American educational system. Yet, to be a foreign language educator must surely mean to be concerned with the teaching and learning of foreign languages beyond French, German, Spanish and other cognate languages. Otherwise we have the unfortunate division of "cognate language educators" versus "truly foreign language educators." There is a challenge here, one that involves the integrity of the field itself: that challenge is to become proactive rather than reactive in expanding the vision of foreign language education in the United States.

## Notes

1. The National Foreign Language Center, with assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, has sponsored three annual meetings of representatives from LCTL language teaching organizations. These representatives now have formed a new National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages to begin planning a national agenda for the enhancement of instruction in a number of LCTLs.

2. NASILP now has over one hundred and twenty member institutions. These programs are designed to provide instruction in institutions which would not normally be able to offer an LCTL. Students are expected to take a major role in instructing themselves using text and tapes, but normally meet with a native speaker, generally untrained, for several hours per week to receive feedback on outside preparation and to practice material already studied prior to these tutorial sessions. Most courses stress the development of conversational skills. Grades are determined by a single final exam, ideally conducted by an outside examiner who normally teaches the language. Many NASILP programs are eventually supplanted by regular course offerings.

3. DLI classifies German as a Category 2 language but the FSI categorizes it as a Category 1 language.

4. The comparison of classroom contact hours to years of academic study is, of course, quite hypothetical. Students in academic programs may spend considerable

language study time outside of classes. Well-designed and well-taught programs may move students to higher levels of proficiency faster than pedagogically poor programs. Intensive programs may promote the attainment of higher proficiency levels, not merely because of increased classroom contact hours, but because of immersion in the language. Undergraduate students in the TFLs often attend intensive summer and study-abroad programs and may thus attain reasonable levels of proficiency prior to graduation.

5. See Jorden and Walton (1989) for a more detailed discussion of the contrasts between the linguistic, discourse and pragmatic features of the TFLs and those of the Indo-European languages.

6. Hammerly's definition of Behavioral Culture as "the sum of everyday life" (Hammerly 1982:514) no doubt encompasses the notion of intercultural pragmatics, but only in a broad, indirect manner. Thus, while I use the term "Behavioral Culture," I mean it to refer exclusively to intercultural pragmatics.

7. The term "cognate" is used here as a convenient short-hand for the meaning "cognate to the Indo-European languages of Europe." The author is aware that other languages, such as Hindi, are in fact members of the Indo-European language family, though they are distinct enough, both linguistically and culturally, from the languages of Europe to be classified as TFLs.

8. In the summer of 1989 the author was asked to help prepare, as a part of a Hokkaido Foundation sponsored teacher workshop, approximately 50 graduate students from Japan to function in American university language programs and departments. More than any other topic discussed during the author's week in residence at the workshop was that of student evaluation of teachers. The Japanese graduate students were not only nervous about, and distrustful of, such a procedure, but were somewhat shocked that such evaluations might be taken seriously by administrators and other faculty.

**Annotated Bibliography**

**Brod, Richard**. 1988. "Foreign Language Enrollments in US Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1986." *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin*, January, 19:39-44. Presents figures for foreign language enrollments in the United States at institutions of higher learning for the years 1983 through 1986.

**Dandonoli, Patricia**. 1987. "Report on Foreign Language Enrollment in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1985." *Foreign Language Annals*, 20:457-70. Presents enrollment figures for the years 1985 through 1987 in U.S. public schools.

**Ellis, Rod**. 1985. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press. Introduces the emerging field of second language acquisition by presenting current issues, problems, and approaches and summarizes the state of current research in many domains. Points out areas of needed research and theory development.

**Hammerly, Hector**. 1982. *Synthesis in Second Language Teaching: An Introduction to Languistics*. Preliminary ed. Blaine, Washington: Second Language Publications. Presents a comprehensive introduction to issues and practice in second language teaching. Author attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching approaches and perspectives rather than presenting a menu of the current approaches.

**Jorden, Eleanor H. and Walton, A. Ronald**. 1987. "Truly Foreign Languages: Instructional Challenges." *Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science*, 490: 110-124. Contrasts the teaching and learning of Indo-European languages with the study of non-Indo-European languages, using Chinese and Japanese as the main examples. The authors emphasize the role of culture in teaching, learning, teacher qualifications, and program administration.

**Kramsch, Claire J**. 1989. *New Directions in the Teaching of Language and Culture*. Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center. Emphasizes the role of discourse in merging language and culture into "linguaculture," a bonding of language and culture. Takes a societal and educational, rather than anthropological, view of culture, contrasting and comparing American notions of culture with those of several European cultures.

**Leech, Geoffrey**. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London; New York: Longman. Addresses the complex and under-researched topic of pragmatics, how language

is used in communication. Attempts to distinguish pragmatics from semantics and lays out a framework for defining and theoretically constraining the emerging field of pragmatics.

**Redfield, James**. 1989. "The Politics of Language Instruction," Association of Departments of Foreign Language Bulletin, April:5-12. Offers a Dean's view of the problems of governance with regard to foreign language instruction in the American university setting. Maintains that foreign language teaching in the university is at a political disadvantage because language teachers are powerless, a fate that derives from their lack of prestige within the academy. Concludes with little hope of changing the present situation.

**Ruhlen, Merritt**. 1987. *A Guide to the World's Languages. Volume 1: Classification.* Stanford, California: Stanford Press. Attempts to classify the world's languages genetically while at the same time presenting a historical view of previous efforts at classification for most language groups. Author tries to present rationale for the proposed classifications. Contains useful charts and tables in summarizing the proposed taxonomy of the world's languages.

**Singerman, Alan J. and Williamson, Richard C**. 1988. *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Middlebury, Vermont: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc. Contains a collection of papers by various authors addressing a number of domains from teaching to textbooks to study abroad as avenues for better integrating the teaching of culture and language.

**Walker, Galal**. 1989. "The Less Commonly Taught Languages in the Context of American Pedagogy," in Helen Lepke (ed.) *Shaping the Future: Challenges and Opportunities*. Middlebury, Vermont: The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc. 111-137. Discusses the growing political and economic importance of the Less Commonly Taught Languages with particular emphasis on East Asia and Eastern Europe. Examines the uniqueness of the LCTLs in the American tradition of emphasis on French, German, and Spanish with respect to teacher qualifications, teaching approaches, textbooks, curricular design, and program management, and offers advice on how the LCTLs can be successfully brought into the larger context of American pedagogy.

**Walton, A. Ronald.** 1988. "The Case of Chinese," in Charles Stansfield and Chip Harman, eds. *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines of the Less Commonly Taught Languages*. The Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. and The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Hastings on Hudson, New York: 24-25. A report based on the author's efforts in helping to develop the ACTFL Revised Generic and Chinese Proficiency Guidelines. Pays special attention to the problems of reading and writing and the perceived shortcomings of the Guidelines to address complex issues in intercultural communication.

**The National Foreign Language Center**

at the Johns Hopkins University
1619 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036